COOPERATIVE LEARNING STAD TYPE METHOD TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS READING ACHIEVEMENT

Metode Tipe Pembelajaran Kooperatif STAD Untuk Meningkatkan Prestasi Membaca Siswa

Bahrun Amin
English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Muhammadiyah University of Makassar
aminbahrun@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research is to find out the improvement of the students' reading achievement. It is done through cooperative learning STAD type method. It is a classroom action research at the first grade students of SMP Kartika XX-3 Makassar. The research was conducted in two cycles in which every cycle consisted of four meetings. This research was held at the first year students of SMP KARTIKA XX-3 MAKASSAR. Subject in this research was class VII.B in 2011/2012 academic year. The students' improvement in reading comprehension could be seen in their mean score namely 5,59 in D-test, 6,33 in cycle 1 and then it became 7,29 in cycle 11. The students' literal reading comprehension dealing with the main idea and meaning of the word sentence in reading text was 5, 65 in D-test 6, 44 in cycle 1 and it became 7, 65 in cycle 11. In D-test in first meeting the percentage of students' activeness is 69%, and in second meeting is 75%, and in third meeting is 77% while in the last meeting is 82%. And then after the evaluation in the cycle II the improvement of the students' reading comprehension.

Key Word: *Reading, STAD type.*

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui peningkatan prestasi membaca siswa. Hal ini dilakukan melalui pembelajaran metode kooperatif tipe STAD. Ini adalah penelitian tindakan kelas pada siswa kelas pertama SMP Kartika XX-3 Makassar. Penelitian ini dilakukan dalam dua siklus dimana setiap siklus terdiri dari empat pertemuan. Penelitian ini dilakukan pada siswa tahun pertama SMP KARTIKA XX-3 MAKASSAR. Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah kelas VII.B di tahun akademik 2011/2012. Siswa peningkatan pemahaman bacaan dapat dilihat pada nilai rata-rata mereka yaitu 5, 59 di D-tes, 6, 33 pada siklus 1 dan kemudian menjadi 7, 29 pada siklus 11. siswa pemahaman membaca literal berkaitan dengan ide utama dan makna kalimat kata dalam membaca teks adalah 5, 65 di D-test 6, 44 dalam siklus 1 dan itu menjadi 7, 65 dalam siklus 11. D-tes di pertemuan pertama persentase keaktifan siswa adalah 69% , dan di pertemuan kedua adalah 75%, dan dalam pertemuan ketiga adalah 77% sedangkan pada pertemuan terakhir adalah 82%. Dan kemudian setelah evaluasi dalam siklus II peningkatan membaca pemahaman siswa.

Kata Kunci: *Reading, tipe STAD.*

Reading is one of the language skills that is very useful for everyone especially for students. By reading they can extend their concept of knowledge, they can improve their language skill and also they can enlarge their insight from the information they get from reading materials. In this way, the students not only read but them also able to comprehend the written text or reading materials. Many reading methods and strategies have been used in classroom alternately. The result

shows that some are successful with particular group of students but some are not. Actually, there are some teachers' still use speech methods (teacher center) in teaching so the students feel bored in the learning process. What should be taken into consideration is the way of teaching and how the students can understand and comprehend the material.

Cooperative learning based on STAD is good to improve reading comprehension because there is a good cooperative in which students pared each other. In learning English, there are four skills to be mastered; namely reading, listening, speaking, and writing. They are important factors in the process of English teaching and learning. Widdowson (1979) state that reading is the process of getting information via printed materials. Reading also is an active process of identifying important ideas and comparing, evaluating, and applying them. Therefore in reading someone has to try to comprehend the main idea about what he/she has read. Without comprehending main idea, it will be very difficult to understand what she/he has read.

Most of the students have low/poor achievement in comprehending reading text. This is affected by the low interest of the student toward reading because the reading text/material is not interesting for the students. The English teachers are expected to think and have effort in helping to increase the students interesting in reading comprehension and presenting reading material. The teacher should find new strategy to make the student interested in reading. One of strategy in teaching reading especially for reading achievement is through cooperative learning. It can be done easily in class room reading activity, in small group, or by individual student.

METHODOLOGY

This classroom action research is conducted in two cycles. It aims at observing the use of Cooperative Learning STAD type in improving the student's reading comprehension. The independent variable of this research is the students' improving in reading comprehension. The dependent variable is the students' reading comprehension dealing with the main idea and the meaning in the reading text. The research subject of this classroom action research was the first year

students of SMP Kartika XX-3 Makassar. The number of the subject is 28 students.

The research used two instruments namely observation which was used to find out the students' presence and activeness in teaching and learning process, and test which was used to acquire detail information about the students' prior ability and their achievement after teaching and learning process end. In this case the writer used essay test.

Table 1. Scoring students correct answer in reading comprehension

Criteria	Score
The meaning and grammar are correct	4
The meaning is correct and some errors of grammar	3
Some errors of meaning and grammar	2
The meaning and grammar are incorrect	1
No answer	0

DEFINITION OF READING

Several linguistics have defined the term reading. Some of whose definitions have basically the same key term-getting information from the printed symbols.

Reinking and Sceiner (1985) in Kustaryo (1988:2) say that, Reading is instantaneous recognition of various written symbols with existing knowledge and comprehension of the information and ideas communicated.

Good (1973) in Irma (1998:5) states "Reading is often described as getting thought from the printed page". This statement tells that the main purpose of reading is to find information from printed symbols, it is not to say out the words from the left to right.

Nuttal (1982) in Lena (2001) states that reading is to recall, to understand, to interpret, and to analyses the printed page. Besides, terry at all in Aminah (996:9) defines reading as the perception of written symbols involving recognition of word, fluency and comprehension. From the concepts above, it is understandable that reading involves the identification and recognition of printed or written symbols, which serve as stimulation for the recall meaning through the reader's manipulation of relevant concept already in this possession.

Marksheffel (1996) in Basri Saleng (2005) defines reading is a very complete way. In his definition, he states not only the purpose of reading but also

the process of reading. He states that reading is a highly complex, purposeful, thinking process engaged in by the entire organism while acquire knowledge, involving new ideas, solving problems, or relaxing and recuperating through the interpretation of printed symbols.

The definition above seems to suggest two main ideas; (1) the process of reading and (2) The purpose reading, (3) reading comprehension and achievement (4) Kind of reading, as elaborated below:

The Process of Reading

1. ***Reading Is a Very complex Process.***

   The complexity of reading refers to getting of meaning. In the first place, before printed symbols are read, they must have meaning. Given to them. In the second place, the written symbol to read must be readable.

2. ***Reading is a Purposeful Process.***

   Every reader reads for particular purposes. It means that different readers may read different purposes. A reader may give his attention to the time of recognition of words to judge the effectiveness and efficiently of time he uses in reading.

3. ***Reading is Thinking Process***

   Reading as a thinking process is not intended to apply that man thinks not only when he read. Thinking occurs when a reader recognized printed symbol, interpreters the print and the response by saving the words, and then gets meaning from the process. Without this process, a reader will not be able to gain perfectly what he / she wants from the page.

The Purpose of Reading

Based on Marksheffel's definition of reading stated above, we can notice many purposes of reading as (1) To acquire knowledge, (2) To evolve ideas, (3) to solve the problems and (4) To relax recuperate these purposes indicate that a reader must not only see and identify the symbols, but he must also be able to interpret what he reads and associate it with past experience. A reader must always try to gain message from what he reads, thus h get knowledge. Besides, the reader must be able to interpret the message in order that he can involve his

ideas and also a reader should be able to associate his reading with his future experience, for application of what has been read.

Reading Comprehension and Achievement

Thinker (1975: 5) states that reading comprehension is not just reading with a loud voice but reading to establish and understand the meaning of words, sentences, and paragraph sense relationship among the ideas. As it is, if a student's just reads loudly but cannot understand the content of the passage, it means he / she fails in comprehending the passage.

Goodman in Otto ET. al. (1979: 151 - 152) defines that reading comprehension is an interaction between taught and language. How far the reader can comprehend the passage in reading process is represented by his ability to understand and criticize the author's messages.

Thinker (1975:11) states that during reading comprehension process, the students must pay full attention in order to be able to catch all ideas written in the passage. As what he says, students reading ability is very important in dealing with reading comprehension because reading can comprehend the passage if he / she is able to understand the meaning of every word or sentences and their correlation among one and others.

The achievement in reading comprehension is really based on how far a reader can comprehend or understand and gain meaningful information encoded by the author. Reading achievement can be gained toward reading skills and reading competence. Besides that, good in reading strategies also treated as a requirement.

Kinds of Reading

Nasr (1984; 78; 79) Classifies reading into two kinds: (1) oral reading or reading aloud and (2) Silent reading.

a. Reading aloud

The reader of this kind of reading can practice and tries to improve his pronunciation, stress and intonation, reading aloud is used when a reader is learning to a combine words with meaning.

b. Silent reading

Silent reading does not imply that a reader read without any sound. A reader of this kind of reading may sound in respond to word, but there is not necessity to say out each word. A reader only says the word in mind it is great emphasis is laid upon the visual thinking capacity of the reader to build up his comprehension of written material without any reference to pronunciation word stress and intonation.

Abbot et al (1981:92) determine the types of reading for the purpose of reading:

1. Skimming

   The eyes run quickly over the text to discuss what is about, the main idea and the gist, however, reader should quickly across and down the page to find specific information he wishes.

2. Scanning

   The reader is on the lookout for a particular item he believes in the text. The scanning can be done to find name, data statistics or fact in writing. The eyes star quickly at the lines of writing.

3. Intensive reading

   It also called study reading .This involves closed reading of the text as the amount of comprehension should be high. The speed of the reading is correspondently slower.

4. Reading comprehension

   Reading comprehension is primarily a matter of developing appropriate efficient comprehension strategies some people had formulated definition of reading comprehension, below are various definition of reading comprehension. According to Kustarso (1988), stated that reading is understanding what has been read is an active, thinking and process that depends not only on comprehension involves understanding the vocabulary seeing the relationship among, words and concept, organizing idea, recognizing author's purpose from this point of view, we say that in reading comprehension there are some factors that and influence the students to understand, the reading material quickly such as mastery of vocabulary

understand with reading material, they have read because without understand it , they cannot catch and identify the ideas of the writer

5. Level of Reading Comprehension

Wayne (1979:173) suggested that there are three levels of comprehension: literal, interpretative, and critical

1. Literal comprehension, which involves acquiring information that is directly stated in a selection, recognizing stated, main idea, details cause.
2. Interpretative comprehensions are way to read critically and analyze carefully. It is mean that those students read to be able to see relationship among ideas, for example how ideas go together and also see the implied meaning of these ideas. They have identified idea and meaning that are not explicitly stated the written text.

   Critical reading that is so evaluate what is read and to examine critically the thought of the writer critical reading compares previous experience to elements in the new material such as, style experience, information and opinion.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING

According to Johnson (2005), cooperative is not assigning a jog to a group of students where are student does all the work and the others put their names on paper. It is not having students sit side by side at the same table to talk with each as they do their individual assignment as well. It is not having students do a task individually with introduction that the one who finish first are to help the solver students.

From the statement above it can be conclude that cooperative learning is a teaching strategy where the small teams and each of the students with different level of ability use a variety of learning activities to improve their understanding of a subject. Each member of a team is responsible not only for learning what is being taught but also for helping team mates learn thus creating an atmosphere of achievement so students work through the assignment unstill all group members successfully understand and complete it.

Cooperative learning has both a general and specific definition. Generally, any venture where people are sharing the learning, about the specially Johnson

and Johnson (1986) defined cooperative learning to include four necessary components are:

1. Face to face interaction may include several types of interaction patterns and verbal exchanges among students, for example: oral summarizing diving and receiving explanation and elaborating.
2. Positive goal independence, students need each other in order to complete the groups' task. This is necessary team spirit. These can be many way for example: mutual goals rewards, shared information and material and assigned roles.
3. Individual accountability, success depends on every member learning or helping with the assigned task. It is important to assess individual learning so that group members can support and help each other their goals, and
4. Demonstration of interpersonal and small group skills. Teacher may need to teach the social skill needed for these instruction settings.

Furthermore, Oliver and Nur Asia (2008) explained cooperative learning in context. Accor ding to his cooperation in context are; individualistic goals encourage students to disregard their classmate; evaluation is criterion referenced and students look after their self – interests or personal mastery or specified objectives and cooperative goals emphasize collaboration and shared understanding on any task (e. g, problem, discussion, writing), evaluation is interdependent a group must successes.

The researches see that the tenet of cooperative learning above which Oliver stated is good and has much benefit if the students and teacher apply it efficiently. Every student has some right and role in doing the task no body fell they can do everything if they get together not individually, they also must perceive that the success of one depends on the success of the other (they sink and swim together). Whatever task students are given to perform, each group member must feel that his or her contribution is necessary for the group's success.

Although there are some differences between the definitions of cooperative learning, some researcher said that cooperative learning is an instructional method that in which small groups of students work together to accomplish a shared goal through changing or reconstructing their knowledge, and some others stated that

cooperative learning is a way of students to maximize their own learning style and attitude.

Theoretical Perspective on Cooperative Learning

Piaget (1970) focuses on the individual as starting point. Knowledge or information is provided through cooperative for the individual to use when becoming aware of differing perspectives and in resolving the difference between them. Cognitive development from purgation view is the product of an individual, perhaps sparked by having to account for differences in perspectives with others (Rogoff, 1990). Piaget stresses that the process of knowing can occur either by way of cognitive conflict, or by way of socio cognitive conflicts, in which intra individual difference during thinking problem solving are catalysts for cognitive growth (Manion, 1995). Piaget believes that individuals work with interdependence and equality on each other's' ideas, so when they interact they learn, receive feedback or are told of something that contradict with their beliefs or current understanding.

Another psychologist who has done extensive work in social context is Vigostsky (1978). He affirms that individual intellectual development cannot be understood without reference to the social setting. Students' social instruction with more competent student's cognitive or learning is developed through intersection with more skilled partners working in the zone of proximal development. This interaction enables students to discuss and exchange their ideas and thoughts which in turn emulate rational thinking process such as the verification of ideas, the planning of strategies in advance, and criticism.

Cooperative learning is the instruction use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning. Students perceive that they can reach their learning goals if and only if the other students in the learning group also reach their goals.

STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION

Slavin (1995) states the Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) is one of the simplest of all cooperative learning methods and is good model to begin with teachers who are new to the cooperative learning approach. STAD has been described as the simplest and easier of a group of cooperative learning

methods. In the STAD approach students are assigned or divided to four or five members' teams reflecting a heterogeneous grouping of high, average, and low achieving students of diverse ethnic background and different genders.

The Components of Students Team Achievement Division (STAD)

There are five major components of STAD approach in cooperative learning, as follows:

1. ***Class Presentation***

   Firstly the materials in STAD are introduced in class presentation. This is a direct teaching like class discussion lead by the teacher. The differences between class presentation and usual teaching are that the presentation should be in focus on STAD unit. From this way, the students are aware that they have to give full pay attention during the class presentation, because it can help them to do the quizzes.

2. ***Teams (in heterogeneous form)***

   Student in team are assigned to four member learning teams are mixed in performance level, gender and ethnicity. The main function of the team is to make sure that all team member study seriously and to prepare their member to do the quizzes well. Team is important component in STAD, in each point it emphasize to make the team member do better and team also have to do best to help each member.

3. ***Individual Quizzes***

   The teacher give individual quizzes after one or two period and after the teacher give class presentation, and team practice, the student will do individual quizzes. The student may not help one, so every student responsible individual to comprehend the materials.

4. ***Individual Improvement Scores***

   The aim of individual improvement score is to give every student reward that can be achieved if they do better than before. Every student can give maximal contribution point to their team. Then, the students will collect point of their based on average level of the score quizzes than their base score.

5. Team Recognition

The team will get certificate or other reward if their average score can reach the criteria. Every week, the teacher introduces new materials through a lecture, class discussion, or some form of a teacher presentation [class presentation]. Team members collaborate on worksheets designed to expand and reinforce the material taught by the teacher. Team members may work on the worksheet in pairs take turns quizzing each other, discuss problem as a group or whatever strategies they wish to learn the assigned the materials.

The following team practice is individual quizzes. In this component, teammates are not permitted to help one another on these quizzes, so the students must serious joining all the team activity and doing the task. Each team in STAD then receives answer sheets, making clear to the students that their task is to learn the concepts or the materials not simply fill out the worksheet. Team members are instructed that their task is not complete until all team members understand the materials.

The quizzes are graded by the teacher and individual score are then calculated into the scores by the teacher. The amount each student contributes to the team score is related to a comparison between the students' prior average and base score. If the students' quiz score is higher than the base score, then that students will contribute positively to the team score. This scoring methods rewards student's improvement [Slavin 1988]. The use of improvement points has been shown to increase student academic performance even without teams, and it is important component of student's team learning [Slavin 1995].

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The research findings indicated that teaching reading comprehension by using cooperative learning based on STAD method can improve the students' literal reading comprehension in terms with the main ideas and also can improve the students' reading comprehension in terms of meaning of word sentence in reading text.

1. The Improvement of the Students' Reading Comprehension

The improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension dealing with main ideas and meaning of the word sentence in reading text can be seen clearly in the following table:

Table 2: The Students' Improvement of Main Ideas in Literal Reading Comprehension

No	Indicator	The Students' Score			IMPROVEMENT (%)		
		D-T	C-1	C- II	D-Test⇨CI	C1⇨CII	D-Test⇨CII
1.	Main ideas	5,59	6,33	7,29	13,23	15,16	30,41

The table above shows that the students' improvement of main ideas before implementation technique indicates that diagnostic test assessment is poor, because the students mean score is only 5.59, but after the implementation of STAD in reading comprehension in cycle I, the assessment of their literal reading comprehension in terms main idea improves in each result of cycle I (6.33),while the improvement of the students' reading comprehension and the meaning of the sentence in reading text from D-Test to cycle 1 is (13.23%). This means that there is an improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension of main idea, but this is classified as fairly, so the researcher decides cooperative learning cycle II. The assessment of cycle II is higher than cycle I where in cycle 1 the students' main idea achievement is 6.33, and in cycle II becomes 7.29, it is classified as fairly to good which means that there is an improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension in main idea. So, the improvement of the students' reading comprehension in main idea from cycle 1 to cycle II is (15, 16%), and also the students' main idea improvement from D-Test-C1 to cycle II is (13.23%). It means that D-Test -CII to cycle II is higher than D-Test-C1 to cycle 1 (30.41%>13.23%). Based on the percentages above there is a significant improvement of students' reading comprehension after taking an action in cycle I and cycle II by using cooperative learning based on STAD method.

Table 3: The Improvement of the Students' Meaning of the word sentence text Literal Reading Comprehension.

No	Indicator	The Students' Score			IMPROVEMENT (%)		
		D-T	C- 1	C- II	D-Test⇨CI	CI⇨CII	CII-D-Test
1.	Word of the sentence	5,65	6,44	7,65	13,98	18,78	35,39

The table above shows that the improvement of the students' meaning of the sentence in reading text before implementation indicates that diagnostic test assessment is 5, 65. But, after implementation of cooperative learning based on STAD method in cycle I, the assessment of their reading comprehension improve in each result of cycle I is 6.44, so the students' meaning of word improvement from D-Test –C1 to cycle 1 is (13,98%). It means that there is an improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension in terms meaning of word, but this is classified as fairly. So, the researcher decides to continue in cycle II. Assessment of cycle II is higher than cycle I (7, 65>6, 44). Therefore, the improvement of the students' meaning of word from cycle I to cycle II is (18, 78%). So, this shows there is a significant improvement of students' literal reading comprehension especially in meaning of word after taking an action in cycle I and cycle II by using cooperative learning based on STAD method.

2. The Students' Improvement Reading Comprehension by Using Cooperative Learning Based on STAD Method

The improvement of the students' reading comprehension at the students' of VII B class SMP Kartika XX-3 Makassar by using cooperative learning based on STAD method as result as table 1 and table 2 will explain as follows:

Table 4: The Students' Improvement in Reading Comprehension by Using Cooperative Learning Based On STAD Method

No	Indicators	The Students' Score			IMPROVEMENT (%)		
		D-T	C- 1	C- II	D-Test⇨CI	CI⇨CII	D-Test⇨CII
1.	Main Ideas	5,59	6,33	7,29	*13,23*	**15,16**	*30,41*
2.	Meaning of word sentence	5,65	6,44	7,65	*13,98*	**18,78**	*35,39*
∑X		11.24	12.77	14.94	27.21	33,94	65,8
$\overline{X}$		5.62	6.38	7.47	13,60	16,97	32,9

The table above shows that the students' main ideas and meaning of word sentence in reading comprehension before implementation is poor (5,62), but after implementation in cycle I the assessment of their reading comprehension improves in each result of cycle I (6,38) is higher than diagnostic test. It means that there is an improvement of the students' reading comprehension. But, this is classified as fairly, so the researcher decides to organizer in cycle II. Assessment of cycle II is higher than from cycle I (7, 47 >6, 38) it classified as fairly to be good which means there is an improvement of the students' reading comprehension. So the improvement of the students' reading comprehension from cycle 1 to cycle II is (16, 97%) and there is also a significant improvement of the students' reading comprehension from diagnostic test to cycle II is 32, 9% which is higher than diagnostic test to cycle I (32, 9%>16, 97 %.). Based on the percentages above there are a significant improvement of the students' reading comprehension by using cooperative learning based on STAD method.

The improvement of the students' reading comprehension in cycle II higher than cycle I (7.47>6.38) the give score are classified from fairly to be good. After evaluation in cycle I and cycle II, there is a significant improvement of the students' reading comprehension in two cycles by using cooperative learning based on STAD method.

3. The Students' Score in Rate Percentage and Frequency

a. The percentage and frequency of the students' main ideas and the meaning of the word sentence in reading text by using reading comprehension through cooperative learning based on STAD method.

Based on the data and analysis was got the result of learning reading in the cycle I and cycle II in the following table and graphic below:

Table 4: The percentage and frequency of the students' literal reading comprehension in terms main idea.

No.	Classification	Score	Cycle I		Cycle II	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Excellent	9.6-10	0	0	-	-
2.	Very good	8.6-9.5	0	0	1	3
3.	Good	7.6-8.5	4	14	6	21
4.	Fairly Good	6,6-7,5	15	53	15	53
5.	Fairly	5,6-6,5	5	17	6	21
6.	Poor	3,6-5,5	4	14	0	0

7	Very poor	0-3.5	0	0	0	0
Total			**28**	***98***	**28**	***98***

Based on the table and graphic above, show that in the cycle 1 there were no students got excellent and very good score. There were 4 students (14%) got good score, 15 students (53%) got fairly good, 5 students (17%) got fairly score, and 4 students (14%) got poor score.

In the cycle II there were no students got excellent, very poor and poor score. There 1 students (3%) got very good score, there were 6 students (21%) got good score, there 15 students (53%) got fairly good, then 6 students (21%) got fairly score.

b. The percentage and frequency of the students' meaning of the word sentence in reading text.

Table 5: The classification and percentage of the students' meaning of the word sentence in reading text.

No.	Classification	Score	Cycle I		Cycle II	
			F	%	F	%
1.	Excellent	9,6-10	0	0	0	-
2.	Very good	8.6-9.5	0	0	2	7
3.	Good	7,6-8,5	7	25	8	28
4.	Fairly good	6,6-7,5	10	35	17	60
5.	Fairly	5,6-6,5	8	28	1	3
6.	Poor	3,6-5,5	3	10	0	0
7	Very poor	0-35	0	0	0	0
Total			**28**	*98*	**28**	*98*

Based on the table and graphic above shows that in the cycle 1 there were no students got excellent and very good score. There were 7 students (25%) got good score, 10 students (35%) got fairly good, 8 students (28%) got fairly score, and 3 students (10%) got poor score.

In the cycle II there were no students got excellent, and very poor .there were 2 students 7% very good score, 8 students 28% got good score, 17 students 60% got fairly good score , there 1 student 3% got fairly.

4. The Result of the Students' Activeness in Learning Process.

This table shows the students' improvement Activities in learning process after applied cooperative learning based on STAD method as follows:

Table 6: Result of the students' activeness each meeting in cycle I and II

CYCLE	Participation				Mean score (X)
	1st Meeting	2nd Meeting	3rd Meeting	4th Meeting	
I	61,6%	66,9%	68,7%	73,2%	67,6%

II	65,1%	69,6%	75%	76,7%	71,6%

The students' participation in learning reading by using cooperative learning based on STAD method. In the cycle I in the first meeting, the students' participation was 61, 6%, the second meeting of the students' participation was 66, 9% and then the third and fourth meeting of the students' participation was 68, 7% and 73, 2%. And the mean score of the students' participation in cycle I is 67, 6%.

The students' participation in the first meeting of cycle is I was 65, 1% then the second meeting of the students' participation was 69, 6%, and the third and fourth meeting of the students' participation was 75% and 76, 7%. And the mean score of the students' participation in cycle II is 71,6%.The research finding form the table above indicates that there is increasing of the students' participation from cycle I to cycle II.

DISCUSSION

The research had been done in two cycles and each cycle consists of four meetings. To make discussion clear, the researcher would like to explain the result of data analysis as follow:

The improvement of students' reading comprehension through cooperative learning based on STAD method had effect that was effective. Where the researcher found the improvement of the students' reading comprehension in terms of main idea in the cycle 1, 4 students got poor score and 5 students got fairly score. Only 4 students got good score, also 15 students got fairly good. The researcher also found the improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension in terms main idea in the cycle 1, 3 students got poor score, and 8 students got fairly score. Only 7 students got good score, 10 students got fairly good. And the mean score of students' reading comprehension in cycle 1 was 6, 5, it had got the standard curriculum but it was still far from target score that the researcher wants to achieve. The target score is 7.5. So the target score could be achieved in the cycle II.

The research found in the cycle I, that although all of students know how to read but most of them difficult to understand what they have read. Based on the unsuccessful teaching in the cycle 1, the researcher decided to do cycle II. In the

cycle II, the researcher revised the lesson plan. Where, when the researcher explained about the step of cooperative learning based on STAD method should explain more clearly. Besides that, the researcher had to give better guidance for the students in reading text. Finally, in the cycle II the mean score of students' reading comprehension is 7.5. Where the researcher found the improvement of the students' reading comprehension of main idea in the cycle II, 6 students got fairly score, 15 got fairly good score, then 6 students got good score and 1 students got very good. There were no students got poor score again in the cycle II. The researcher also found the meaning of the sentence in reading text in the cycle II, 2 students got very good score, then 8 students got good score and 17 students got fairly good. Than 1 student got fairly score, there were no students got poor score in the cycle II. It means that the mean score of students' reading comprehension got improvement. Meanwhile, the result of the students' participation also improve from the first meeting students' participation was 61,6%, the second meeting of the students' participation was 66,9% and then the third and fourth meeting of the students' participation was 68,7% and 73,2%. And the mean score of students' participation in cycle 1 is 67, 6%.

The students' participation in the first meeting of cycle II was 65, 1% then the second meeting of the students' participation was 69, 6%, and the third and fourth meeting of the students' participation was 75% and 76, 7%. And the mean score of the students' participation in cycle II is 71, 6%. Finally, the students mean score could get score was 7.5 where the target is 7.5. It means that the target that had been said in the chapter 1 could be achieved.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussions in the previous chapter, the following conclusions are presented:

The improvement of the students' literal reading comprehension by using Through Cooperative Learning Based on STAD Method was significant to improve of the students' literal reading comprehension at the first grade students' of SMP KARTIKA XX-3 MAKASSAR. Indicated that there was improved the students' reading comprehension, after getting the implementation of action among II cycles, and the findings are 15,16% in the first cycle and 18,78% in the

second cycle. The above conclusion shown that the applied action, that is the use of cooperative learning based on STAD method as teaching in learning English process, can improve the students' reading comprehension in terms of dealing with main idea and meaning of the sentence in reading text.

REFERENCES

Abbot, Gery, John, Mckeating Douglas: Wingard Peter. The Teaching of English as an International Language: A Practice Guide Great Britain Biddels Ltd.

Depdikbud: Jakarta. Goodman. 1968. *English Teaching Reading in Today Elementary Schools*. Boston. Houghton Miffhin Company. USA.

Gay, L. R. 1981. *Educational research: Competencies for Analysis and Application. 2nd edition.* U.S.A.: Charles. E. Neril Publishing Company Colombus.

Good. 1973. *The dictionary of education. New York. Mc row hill Book Company*.

Johnson, D.W. Johnson, R.T, and Holubec, E. J, 1986, *Circles of Learning Cooperation in the classroom.* Edina, MN: Interactive Book Company.

Kagan, Spencer. 1992. *Cooperative Learning*. Sam Juan Capistrano: Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Kagan, S. Educational Leadership. Retrieved on August, 23, 2008, from: Http/home capecod. Net. pannist / tedsarticles, htm. On 24th June 2011.

Kustaryo, Sukirah, *Reading Technique for College Students*. Jakarta: P2LPTK, 1988.

Marksseffel, Ned D.1966. *Better of the Reading Secondary School*. New York: The Royal Press Company.

Nasr, Raja T. *Teaching and learning: Selected and simplified reading. London: Longman Group Limited.*

Nuttal, Christine. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skill in a Foreign Language*. London: Heineman Educational Book.

Oliver, Kevin. 1999. Ideas on Cooperative Learning and the Use of Small Group. Retrieved. From http:/www.howardcc.edu.On 11th July 2011.

Oliver, Nur Asia. 2008. Using Cooperative Script Technique to Increase Reading Comprehension at the second Years Students. A Thesis UIN Alauddin Makassar.

Sudjana. 1999. *Metode Statistika*. Bandung. PT Gramedia.

Piaget, J. 1970. The Science of Education and Psychology of the Child. New York: Grossman.

Rogoff, B. 1990. Apprenticeship in Thinking: cognitive Development in social Context. NY: Oxford University.

Slavin, E. Robert. 2004, *cooperative learning theory, research, and practice.* Allymand Bacon, London.

Slavin E. Robert.2005, *Cooperative Learning: theory, research, and Allymand Bacon, London.*

Thinker, A. Miles and Cullogh, M.Mc Cinstance. 1975. Teaching Elementary Reading. New Jersey. Practice Hall, Inc.

Thinker, A. A. Miller and Oullogh, M.Mc Constance 1975. *Teaching Reading Elementary, New Jersey*: Practice. Hall Inc. Englewood CLIFFS.

Vigosky, L.S 1980. Mind in Society: the Development of Higher Psychological process. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wayne, 1979. *How to Teach Reading.* New York. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Widdowson, H.G. 1985. T*eaching Language as communication*. New York: Oxford University Press.